

2005 NAIP Survey Executive Summary

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second wave of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second wave of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to State Offices on 3 Nov 2005 and 20 Jan 2005, and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05, 17 Feb and 9 Mar 06 respectively. Surveys were to be sent to approximately 2445 counties. Approximately 1216 (49.7%) of the counties completed the survey. Out of the responses received, 47907 of a possible 66190 points were achieved, for an average score of 72.4%. This percentage translates into an overall national rating of “Satisfied” for 2005 NAIP. Of the counties completing the survey, .7% were “Completely Unsatisfied” with 2005 NAIP overall, 21.9% were “Unsatisfied”, 4.0% were “Neither Satisfied or Unsatisfied”, 65.7% were “Satisfied”, and 7.7% were “Completely Satisfied” with 2005 NAIP. The map on the following page graphically represents these results.

These results indicate that generally the States that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, since the overall national score of 72.4% falls between overall ratings of “Satisfied” and “Neither Satisfied or Unsatisfied”, there is room for improvement.

Questions 13 and 14 of the survey required textual comments. Most comments revolved around color quality/resolution, and timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2.

A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Question 1, “Was imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?” Statistically, the highest scoring question was Question 4, “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?”

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	3.277589134	Mean	3.559930009	Mean	3.972627737	Mean	4.05877193	Mean	3.780487805
Standard Error	0.040393115	Standard Error	0.035764806	Standard Error	0.034436373	Standard Error	0.033544404	Standard Error	0.035469439
Median	3	Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	4
Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	1.386372672	Standard Deviation	1.209146692	Standard Deviation	1.140046796	Standard Deviation	1.132589425	Standard Deviation	1.089206345
Sample Variance	1.922029187	Sample Variance	1.462035722	Sample Variance	1.299706696	Sample Variance	1.282758807	Sample Variance	1.186370462
Kurtosis	-1.191312435	Kurtosis	-0.523591349	Kurtosis	0.507083244	Kurtosis	0.737614612	Kurtosis	-0.123687739
Skewness	-0.229356393	Skewness	-0.610975338	Skewness	-1.098535351	Skewness	-1.216092632	Skewness	-0.697365383
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	3861	Sum	4069	Sum	4354	Sum	4627	Sum	3565
Count	1178	Count	1143	Count	1096	Count	1140	Count	943
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	3.782882883	Mean	3.669082126	Mean	3.905342081	Mean	6.995773457	Mean	6.580645161
Standard Error	0.037926445	Standard Error	0.039775181	Standard Error	0.033010482	Standard Error	0.070424125	Standard Error	0.075248379
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	8	Median	6
Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	8	Mode	8
Standard Deviation	1.263582572	Standard Deviation	1.144530393	Standard Deviation	1.078286264	Standard Deviation	2.422221378	Standard Deviation	2.582675223
Sample Variance	1.596640915	Sample Variance	1.309949822	Sample Variance	1.162701267	Sample Variance	5.867156402	Sample Variance	6.670211308
Kurtosis	-0.289667537	Kurtosis	-0.270822823	Kurtosis	0.111262039	Kurtosis	-0.650537269	Kurtosis	-1.03954888
Skewness	-0.859828146	Skewness	-0.62293818	Skewness	-0.854689784	Skewness	-0.511702057	Skewness	-0.243569172
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	4199	Sum	3038	Sum	4167	Sum	8276	Sum	7752
Count	1110	Count	828	Count	1067	Count	1183	Count	1178

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

